

---

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

---

---

SAMUEL GROVER IVEY,

Petitioner,

*versus*

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-ID,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:15-CV-239

**MEMORANDUM ORDER ADOPTING  
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Samuel Grover Ivey, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court referred this matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of the court.

The magistrate judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge concerning this matter. The magistrate judge recommends the petition be dismissed as barred by the applicable statute of limitations.

The court has received the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record, pleadings, and all available evidence. No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation.

**ORDER**

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered dismissing the petition.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 8th day of September, 2015.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marcia A. Crone".

---

MARCIA A. CRONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE